

No. S-25-295

IN THE NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT

JENNIFER PROSOSKI,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JASON REGAN,

Defendant-Appellee.

On Appeal from the District Court of Douglas County
The Honorable Tressa Alioth

**BRIEF OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AS AMICUS
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

MICHAEL T. HILGERS (#24483)
Attorney General of Nebraska

CODY S. BARNETT (#28391)
Solicitor General

Nebraska Department of Justice
1445 K Street, Room 2115
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Tel.: (402) 471-2683
Fax: (402) 471-3297

ZACHARY B. POHLMAN (#27376)
Deputy Solicitor General
zachary.pohlman@nebraska.gov

KATELYN (MILLER) RICH
Senior Certified Law Clerk

Counsel for Attorney General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Authorities	3
Statement of Interest.....	7
Propositions of Law.....	7
Background	8
Argument.....	10
I. The Rules of Professional Conduct Prohibit False Citations.....	10
II. Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence Should Be Encouraged, Not Chilled.....	13
A. AI supports legitimate and beneficial legal work.	13
B. AI-specific rules of conduct or disclosure are not necessary or warranted.....	16
Conclusion	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ader v. Ader</i> , 2025 WL 2831332 (N.Y. Sup. Oct. 1, 2025)	12
<i>ByoPlanet Int’l, LLC v. Johansson</i> , 792 F. Supp. 3d 1341 (S.D. Fla. 2025)	12
<i>Davis v. Marion Cnty. Sup. Ct. Juv. Det. Ctr.</i> , No. 1:24-cv-01918, 2025 WL 2502308 (S.D. Ind. Sept. 2, 2025).....	12
<i>In re Baby Boy</i> , 271 N.E.3d 524 (Ill. App. Ct. 2025).....	13
<i>In re Neusom</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00503, 2024 WL 982508 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 11, 2024)	13
<i>In re Richburg</i> , 671 B.R. 918 (Bankr. D.S.C. 2025).....	11
<i>Mata v. Avianca, Inc.</i> , 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023)	12
<i>People v. Crabill</i> , No. 23PDJ067, 2023 WL 8111898 (Colo. O.P.D.J. Nov. 22, 2023).....	13
<i>State ex rel. Couns. for Discipline of Neb. Sup. Ct. v. Carter</i> , 282 Neb. 596 (2011)	12
<i>United States v. Hayes</i> , 763 F. Supp. 3d 1054 (E.D. Cal. 2025).....	12

Court Rules

Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond.

§ 3-501.1	7, 11
§ 3-501.3	7, 11
§ 3-503.3(a)(1)	7, 12
§ 3-508.4(c)	13

Other Authorities

A.B.A. Comm. on Ethics & Pro. Resp.,

Formal Op. 512 (July 29, 2024)	11, 13
--------------------------------------	--------

AI Hallucination Cases, Damien Charlotin,

https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/ (last visited Jan. 21, 2026)	9, 11
---	-------

aiR for Review, Relativity,

https://perma.cc/GD64-Y28J	15
---	----

Cole Stryker, *What Are Large Language Models*

(<i>LLMs</i>)?, IBM, https://perma.cc/QD9S-R26U	8
--	---

Court Decision on Proposed Rule,

5th Cir., https://perma.cc/8KZL-JAJ3	16, 17
---	--------

<i>Diligence</i> , Black’s Law Dictionary (12th ed. 2024)	11
---	----

eDiscovery, Everlaw (Jan. 24, 2024),

https://perma.cc/58GQ-4NYG	15
---	----

For Transactional Work, Harvey,

https:// perma.cc/ZJ8K-9J9	16
--	----

Guidelines to Parties and Counsel in Civil Cases

Proceeding Before the Hon. Tiffany Johnson,

N.D. Ga., https://perma.cc/PT7E-LZP7	16
---	----

Other Authorities—continued

Henry A. Kissinger et al., <i>The Age of AI and Our Human Future</i> (2021)	8
<i>How ChatGPT and Our Foundation Models Are Developed</i> , OpenAI, https://perma.cc/44TK-UUE	15
<i>In re Use of Artificial Intelligence</i> , No.3:24-mc-104 (W.D.N.C. June 18, 2024)	16
John G. Roberts, Jr., <i>2023 Year End Report on the Federal Judiciary</i> , U.S. Sup. Ct. (Dec. 31, 2023), https://perma.cc/V37L-GBDW	13
Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman, <i>Memorandum of Law Requirements</i> , N.D. Ill., https://perma.cc/Q4LQ-S3B6	16
<i>Legal Research Agent</i> , Midpage.ai, https://perma.cc/UY86-CFF5	15
<i>Lexis+AI</i> , LexisNexis, https://perma.cc/CE4M-TSC4	14
<i>Meet Manage AI: Smarter Practice Management Starts Here</i> , Clio (Nov. 5, 2025), https://perma.cc/3RCE-GRF	16
Mrinank Sharma et al., <i>Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models</i> , in Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2024)	9
<i>Standing Order re: Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) in Cases Assigned to Judge Baylson</i> , E.D. Pa. (June 6, 2023), https://perma.cc/GTQ3-EGDX	16

Other Authorities—continued

- U.S. Magistrate Judge Maritza Dominguez Braswell,
Guidance on AI & Hallucinations,
<https://perma.cc/9DGA-MGSB> 10
- Westlaw Edge with AI-Assisted Research*,
Thompson Reuters, <https://perma.cc/G729-B4CA> 14
- Why Language Models Hallucinate*, OpenAI
(Sept. 5, 2025), <https://openai.com/index/why-language-models-hallucinate/>8

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

On its face, this appeal is about a dissolution of marriage. But the briefing and motions practice tell another story—one in which artificial intelligence (“AI”) plays a central role. The Attorney General expresses no views on the decree of dissolution. He does, however, have a significant interest in the rules that govern the use of AI in the practice of law. To increase efficiency and reduce costs, the Attorney General, consistent with his ethical duties, is implementing AI-powered applications in the Nebraska Department of Justice. The Attorney General encourages this Court to follow the federal District of Nebraska in rejecting AI-specific ethics or certification rules; the current rules of professional conduct already prohibit misuse of AI. Ethical AI innovation in the law should be fostered, not chilled.

PROPOSITIONS OF LAW

1. The duty of competence requires lawyers to possess the necessary “legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, preparation and judgment” to represent a client well. Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-501.1.
2. Lawyers “should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology.” *Id.* n.6.
3. Lawyers must also “act with reasonable diligence.” Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-501.3.
4. The duty of candor prohibits lawyers from making a knowingly “false statement of fact or law to a tribunal.” *Id.* § 3-503.3(a)(1).

BACKGROUND

Artificial intelligence (“AI”) is the most significant technological innovation in centuries. Almost no area of human life will be left untouched by AI. That includes the law. Used responsibly, AI helps lawyers work faster, write better, and serve clients more effectively. As with any tool, its value—and ethical implementation—depends on the hand that wields it.

A technical explanation of AI is beyond the scope of this brief, but at its core, AI refers to systems that recognize patterns, draw inferences, and make predictions. See Henry A. Kissinger et al., *The Age of AI and Our Human Future* 8 (2021). Generative AI, a newer branch, goes further. It creates new content rather than sort what already exists. *Id.* at 12. Large language models (“LLMs”) are one kind of generative AI. They learn the patterns of language and use those patterns to produce text that reads as if written by a person. Cole Stryker, *What Are Large Language Models (LLMs)?*, IBM, <https://perma.cc/QD9S-R26U>.

The way large language models work explains both their promise and peril. LLMs train on vast collections of text—books, websites, judicial opinions, and more. *Id.* From those examples, the model learns which word (in AI parlance, a “token”) likely comes next. *Id.* When asked a question, it does not search a database for the answer. It predicts the next sequence of words based on patterns it has seen before. *Id.* The result is software that speaks with confidence, not comprehension. LLMs aim for linguistic fluency, not real-world accuracy.

Because of that design, LLMs can produce *hallucinations*—text that looks right but is factually false. *Why Language Models Hallucinate*, OpenAI (Sept. 5, 2025), <https://openai.com/index/why-language-models-hallucinate/>. In law, hallucinations

often take the form of perfectly Bluebooked citations of cases that do not exist. General-purpose models like ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini are especially prone to this problem. They train on broad internet text, not curated legal databases. As a result, they mimic the rhythm of legal writing without confirming the authority behind it. Compounding this problem is that LLMs are trained to be “sycophantic”—they tell users what they want to hear regardless of the truth, giving a false sense of security in an LLM’s output. *See* Mrinank Sharma et al., *Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models*, in Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2024).

The technical realities underscore a simple point: general-purpose LLMs are not legal research tools. They can enhance and support professional judgment but cannot replace it. They are drafting aids that must be supervised, verified, and corrected by the lawyer who uses them. Lawyers around the country are learning this lesson the hard way. *See AI Hallucination Cases*, Damien Charlotin, <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/> (last visited Jan. 21, 2026) (cataloguing court decisions addressing hallucinations).

While ethical problems lurk, responsible use of AI can be a significant force multiplier for attorneys. It can help lawyers write clearly, find arguments, draft discovery, summarize documents, and digest data, all to serve clients more efficiently. Even general-purpose models are quite skilled at tasks like issue spotting and flagging weak points in a brief. Legal-specific models show even more promise, and new products enter the legal marketplace every day. In the right hands, AI becomes a tool for precision, not deception. Handled well, the technology can sharpen judgment and elevate the standards of the profession.

ARGUMENT

I. The Rules of Professional Conduct Prohibit False Citations.

A. “Hallucinations are new, but inaccuracies are not.” U.S. Magistrate Judge Maritza Dominguez Braswell, *Guidance on AI & Hallucinations* at 1, <https://perma.cc/9DGA-MGSB>. For as long as lawyers have submitted briefs, they have been tempted to twist a precedent further than a fair reading would allow, to omit crucial words from quotes, or to ignore binding authority and hope their opponents do not find it. Less pioneering lawyers may be tempted to plagiarize or submit hastily checked work of interns as their own. The lure of relying on an inaccuracy for self-interested gain is inherent to the practice of law.

And yet, new technology spawns new temptations. The recent and rapid rise of generative AI holds immense promise for more efficient and less costly legal services. But if misunderstood and misused, AI-powered tools can produce work product with hallucinations—in colloquial terms, fake legal authorities. Like the lawyer who uses ellipses to hide an important “not” in a quote, the lawyer who submits a brief that cites fake cases abuses the court’s trust.

The Nebraska Rules of Professional Conduct disallow such practices and provide grounds to discipline those who submit briefing with inaccuracies. The duties of competence, diligence, and candor, as well as the catchall rule against professional misconduct, already require scrupulosity in representations to the court. While the technology is new, the lawyer’s ethical duties remain unchanged and as important as ever.

B. A brief with a materially false or inaccurate representation of law violates a lawyer's professional duties. It does not matter whether the false statement or citation made its way into the brief through the lawyer's intentional misrepresentation, negligence, or use of generative AI.

Duty of Competence. The duty of competence requires lawyers to possess the “legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, preparation and judgment” to represent a client well. Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-501.1. To maintain competence, lawyers “should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology.” *Id.* n.6. The American Bar Association—in a formal ethics opinion—explains that lawyers must “remain vigilant about . . . the risk of producing inaccurate output” with AI; failing to verify AI output “could violate the duty to provide competent representation.” A.B.A. Comm. on Ethics & Pro. Resp., Formal Op. 512, at 3, 4 (July 29, 2024). Hallucinations are no secret. To date, courts have seen over 821 cases where generative AI produced fake citations. *AI Hallucination Cases*, Damien Charlotin, <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/> (last visited Jan. 21, 2026). As one court put it, competence “require[s] proper knowledge of the technology,” and “[b]lind reliance on work product or research generated by AI” may violate that duty. *In re Richburg*, 671 B.R. 918, 923, 924 (Bankr. D.S.C. 2025).

Duty of Diligence. Lawyers must also “act with reasonable diligence.” Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-501.3. Diligence can refer to both “promptness,” *id.*, and the “attention and care required from a person in a given situation.” *Diligence*, Black’s Law Dictionary (12th ed. 2024). Lawyers who use generative AI to draft a brief at the last second due to “procrastination” violate the duty of diligence. *See* Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-501.3 n.3.

Likewise, lawyers who use generative AI to draft briefs without verifying citations violate the duty by not giving the filing the attention it deserves. As one federal district court explained: “While the use of AI by itself is not inherently suspect, wholesale reliance on AI without further inquiry or diligence by a lawyer is conduct which a court should deter, as lawyers must always conduct a reasonable inquiry.” *ByoPlanet Int’l, LLC v. Johansson*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 1341, 1355 (S.D. Fla. 2025).

Duty of Candor. The duty of candor prohibits lawyers from making a knowingly “false statement of fact or law to a tribunal.” Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-503.3(a)(1). The rule recognizes that lawyers are “officers of the court” and must “avoid conduct that undermines the integrity of the adjudicative process.” *Id.* n.2. In applying Indiana’s duty of candor, one federal district court disciplined an attorney who “made false statements of law to the court when he relied on two cases that do not exist” and thus “knowingly failed to fulfill his duty to review the brief he filed and verify that the law he presented was good law.” *Davis v. Marion Cnty. Sup. Ct. Juv. Det. Ctr.*, No. 1:24-cv-01918, 2025 WL 2502308, at *5 (S.D. Ind. Sept. 2, 2025).

Even if lawyers do not *knowingly* cite hallucinated cases, the duty of candor still requires owning up to a mistake. Indeed, this Court has considered an “apparent attempt to conceal” wrongdoing an aggravating factor in disciplining an attorney for misconduct. *State ex rel. Couns. for Discipline of Neb. Sup. Ct. v. Carter*, 282 Neb. 596, 608 (2011). Likewise, courts around the country have imposed stringent sanctions on attorneys who misled the court after it discovered improper use of AI. *E.g.*, *United States v. Hayes*, 763 F. Supp. 3d 1054, 1069–73 (E.D. Cal. 2025); *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443, 449 (S.D.N.Y. 2023); *Ader v. Ader*, 2025 WL 2831332, *3 (N.Y. Sup. Oct. 1, 2025).

Professional Misconduct. Finally, a lawyer commits professional misconduct by engaging “in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.” Neb. Ct. R. of Prof. Cond. § 3-508.4(c). While the duty of candor carries a scienter requirement, the American Bar Association concluded that the rule banning misrepresentations does not. In its words, “[e]ven an unintentional misstatement to a court can involve a misrepresentation.” A.B.A., Formal Op. 512 at 10. That is so whether the misrepresentation came about through AI or old-fashioned carelessness. Courts have found that unchecked uses of generative AI implicate the rule against misrepresentations as well. *E.g.*, *In re Baby Boy*, 271 N.E.3d 524, 552–53, 555 (Ill. App. Ct. 2025); *In re Neusom*, No. 2:23-cv-00503, 2024 WL 982508, at *5 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 11, 2024); *People v. Crabill*, No. 23PDJ067, 2023 WL 8111898, at *1 (Colo. O.P.D.J. Nov. 22, 2023).

II. Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence Should Be Encouraged, Not Chilled.

Like any emergent technology, generative AI can be abused. But the enormous potential of AI should not be overshadowed by those who fail to understand or properly use it. In capable hands, AI can increase efficiency, lower the costs, and help lawyers submit higher quality work product.

A. AI supports legitimate and beneficial legal work.

In his 2023 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary, Chief Justice John Roberts aptly noted that “[l]egal research may soon be unimaginable without” artificial intelligence. John G. Roberts, Jr., *2023 Year End Report on the Federal Judiciary* at 5, U.S. Sup. Ct. (Dec. 31, 2023), <https://perma.cc/V37L-GBDW>. A

prescient observation indeed. As technology is wont to do, the selection, scope, and speed of AI-powered tools continue to expand at exponential rates. Used responsibly, everything from AI-driven Google searches to customizable agentic AI systems paves the way for better, faster, and less expensive work product. Soon—whether we know it or not—AI will touch nearly every aspect of professional life. An overview of commercially available tools shows just how influential AI’s effect on the legal profession is—and will continue to be.

Legal Research. Soon, the basic Boolean search may go the way of scouring the stacks for regional reporters. Westlaw and LexisNexis both offer built-in AI research tools that respond to natural language prompts. The tools search curated legal databases to draft AI-drafted memoranda. *See Westlaw Edge with AI-Assisted Research*, Thompson Reuters, <https://perma.cc/G729-B4CA>; *Lexis+AI*, LexisNexis, <https://perma.cc/CE4M-TSC4>. Users can then verify the output by reading the sources (cases, statutes, treatises) hyperlinked in the memoranda. Beyond legacy systems, general-purpose LLMs like Claude and Grok can provide high-level overviews of new areas of law, helping lawyers craft prompts for Westlaw and Lexis. A lawyer who finds a key case after one hour of Boolean searching might spot that same authority with only fifteen minutes of AI-assisted research.

Legal Writing. Some AI tools can write whole briefs. While Westlaw and Lexis’s current products cite real sources, they often misstate the law. General-purpose LLMs suffer the opposite defect: while they often state the law correctly, they also produce hallucinations. The solution to both pitfalls is an LLM that pulls from a curated legal database. That is what products like Midpage.ai offer. Midpage.ai is a plugin to ChatGPT that conducts legal research by “executing a series of queries, filtering

cases for relevance, and generating answers based [on] the right cases,” which are pulled directly from its own legal database. *Legal Research Agent*, Midpage.ai, <https://perma.cc/UY86-CFF5>. That differs from ChatGPT alone, which trains on “publicly available internet content,” as many attorneys are learning the hard way. *How ChatGPT and Our Foundation Models Are Developed*, OpenAI, <https://perma.cc/44TK-UUE>. Tech-savvy lawyers can use tools like Midpage.ai to analyze legal documents, conduct in-depth research, and help draft briefs—improving quality and speed while reducing costs for clients.

Discovery. One of AI’s most promising applications will reduce the time, grunt work, and organizational morass associated with large-scale discovery. E-discovery tools have been on the market for years, but recent AI integration has made reviewing and managing massive amounts of digital data easier. First- and second-year associates once billed mindless hours reviewing tens of thousands of documents. Those days may be ending with tools like Relativity, which uses AI to “identify key content across hundreds, thousands, or even millions of documents—with transparent rationale.” *aiR for Review*, Relativity, <https://perma.cc/GD64-Y28J>. Similarly, competitor Everlaw uses AI to “analyze and categorize large volumes of electronic documents based on their relevance to a legal case,” helping attorneys “save time and money while ensuring that they have access to all relevant information.” Justin Smith, *AI Document Review: How Legal Teams Can Utilize Artificial Intelligence in eDiscovery*, Everlaw (Jan. 24, 2024), <https://perma.cc/58GQ-4NYG>.

Transactional Support. AI-powered applications streamline the work of non-litigators too. From managing deadlines to communicating with clients to generating documents, AI assistants can help lawyers close deals with unprecedented precision

and speed. Platforms like Harvey promise to “augment transactional work, helping lawyers complete due diligence [and] conduct contract analysis.” *For Transactional Work*, Harvey, <https://perma.cc/ZJ8K-9J9F>. Others, like Clio, offer similar services and emphasize security, telling prospective users that they “can harness the power of AI without concerns about compromising your clients’ data.” Megan Bennett, *Meet Manage AI: Smarter Practice Management Starts Here*, Clio (Nov. 5, 2025), <https://perma.cc/3RCE-GRF9>. As lawyers grow more comfortable with AI assistants, even more sophisticated forms of transactional efficiency and client service will become possible.

B. AI-specific rules of conduct or disclosure are not necessary or warranted.

Courts take various approaches to sanctioning misconduct for unverified use of generative AI. At least one has banned AI from drafting documents. Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman, *Memorandum of Law Requirements*, N.D. Ill., <https://perma.cc/Q4LQ-S3B6>. Another limits which AI products lawyers may use. *In re Use of Artificial Intelligence*, No.3:24-mc-104 (W.D.N.C. June 18, 2024). Others permit the use of AI but require attorneys to certify that they verified all citations. *E.g.*, *Guidelines to Parties and Counsel in Civil Cases Proceeding Before the Hon. Tiffany Johnson* at 9, N.D. Ga., <https://perma.cc/PT7E-LZP7>; *Standing Order re: Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) in Cases Assigned to Judge Baylson*, E.D. Pa. (June 6, 2023), <https://perma.cc/GTQ3-EGDX>. And the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently *rejected* a proposed AI-certification rule, instead reminding “parties and counsel” that briefs “shall be carefully checked for truthfulness and accuracy as the rules already require.” *Court Decision on Proposed Rule*, 5th Cir., <https://perma.cc/8KZL-JAJ3>.

The federal District of Nebraska recently followed the Fifth Circuit’s lead. In 2024, the court adopted a rule that required parties to certify “that no generative artificial intelligence program was used in drafting the document” or that “a human signatory of the document verified the accuracy of all generated text, including all citations and legal authority.” NECivR 7.1(d)(4)(B) (Dec. 2024). But after just one year, the court abandoned the certification requirement in favor of a reminder that parties “are required, if using generative artificial intelligence programs, to verify the contents of their filings,” and a warning that unverified filings “may be stricken and/or sanctions may be imposed on the filing party.” NECivR 7.1(d)(2) (Dec. 2025).

The federal District of Nebraska’s new approach is optimal for two reasons. *First*, like the Fifth Circuit’s decision, its rule acknowledges that submission of fake citations is already sanctionable under existing rules of professional conduct. Before AI entered the scene, no one would have questioned that a lawyer who submits a brief with made-up cases and quotations violates the duties of competence, diligence, and candor and commits professional misconduct by making material misrepresentations. In the words of the Fifth Circuit, stating that “I used AI” is not a valid “excuse for an otherwise sanctionable offense.” *Court Decision on Proposed Rule*, 5th Cir., <https://perma.cc/8KZL-JAJ3>.

Second, and importantly, an AI certification requirement may unduly stifle innovative uses of AI or unfairly prejudice those who use the technology ethically. With respect to innovation, the incorporation of AI into daily law practice is inevitable. Given the boost to efficiency and quality and attendant reductions in costs that AI can provide, a lawyer’s refusal to implement AI solutions may raise its own ethical questions. Certification requirements may chill this quickly-evolving transition to a new

technological framework. As to prejudice, sophisticated lawyers who use AI and certify that fact may face unwarranted scrutiny from courts skeptical that it can be ethically implemented.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is new, but a lawyer's duty to submit honest, verified briefing is not. This Court should remind the bar that our ethical obligations require us to understand both AI's enormous potential and its potential for hallucinations. But this Court need not, and should not, outright ban the use of AI or adopt an AI-specific certification. Generative AI and other AI-powered tools are quickly developing and quickly changing how law is practiced. Consistent with our ethical duties, we in the legal industry must do our best to keep up. And when we do, the courts, opposing counsel, and ultimately our clients will be the beneficiaries.

Dated: January 23, 2026

Respectfully submitted.

MICHAEL T. HILGERS (#24483)
Attorney General of Nebraska

CODY S. BARNETT (#28391)
Solicitor General

Nebraska Department of Justice
1445 K Street, Room 2115
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Tel.: (402) 471-2683
Fax: (402) 471-3297

/s/ Zachary B. Pohlman
ZACHARY B. POHLMAN (#27376)
Deputy Solicitor General
zachary.pohlman@nebraska.gov

KATELYN (MILLER) RICH
Senior Certified Law Clerk

Counsel for Attorney General

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This amicus brief complies with the typeface and word-count requirements of Neb. Ct. R. App. P. § 2-103 because it contains 3,791 words excluding this certificate. This brief was prepared using Microsoft Word 365.

/s/ Zachary B. Pohlman
ZACHARY B. POHLMAN